

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13 and 14 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13 and 14 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to correct clerical errors. Claim 1 is amended to correct the spelling of "telechelic." Claim 13 is amended to correct its dependency. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Non-Statutory Obviousness - Type Double Patenting

Claims 1, 2, 9-11, 13 are rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 7,157,283. Claims 4-7 are rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 7,157,283 in view of Wolfe (U.S. 4,500,687). Claim 14 is rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 7,157,283 in view of Roth et al. (U.S. 6,521,710).

Accompanying this paper, Applicant has provided a Terminal Disclaimer, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.321, disclaiming the terminal part of any patent granted on the present application beyond the expiration date of the statutory term of U.S. Patent No. 7,157,283.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wolfe (4,500,687). The Office Action asserts that Wolfe teaches a method for producing polymer materials. The Office Action refers generally to figures 1-3 and the disclosure in columns 42-49 in support of its assertion that Wolfe teaches the formation of a library of compounds of varying properties. (See Office Action, paragraph 6).

Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, Wolfe cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, as set forth in the pending claims. The invention provides a continuous method of making a combinatorial library of materials by providing a plug flow reactor, introducing one or more components into the plug flow reactor, and introducing or changing over

time at least one variable affecting the one or more components to produce a combinatorial library of materials. The breadth of change variables and the resulting combinatorial library of materials are further described in claim 1. (See claim 1).

Unlike the present invention, Wolfe describes a multi-reactor system. Although the system described by Wolfe is capable of continuous process manufacturing, Wolfe contemplates the use of a four - stage reactor train to be used solely in the manufacture of HIPPO (polyether reinforced impact styrene polymer). Wolfe is solely focused on the manufacture of HIPPO and does not contemplate the manufacture of a combinatorial library of materials in the manner contemplated by the present invention. Additionally, Wolfe's multi-reactor system (e.g., embodied in the apparatus of Figure 3) does not use a single plug flow reactor to manufacture HIPPO or to provide the combinatorial library of materials. Instead, Wolfe describes the use of multiple reactors to facilitate polymerization of HIPPO monomers and phase inversion of the HIPPO polymer, and Wolfe appears to need multiple reactors to provide desired variations in the reaction and processing conditions. For example, Wolfe provides different temperature zones and different stir rates within each reactor as well as providing optional recirculation means in at least some of the reactors. (See generally, Figure 3; col. 43, line 40 through col. 45, line 23). Wolfe's manufacture of HIPPO is very different from the process of the present invention. Wolfe simply fails to provide a combinatorial library of materials using a single plug flow reactor, as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Because Wolfe does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention, Wolfe cannot be said to anticipate the Applicant's invention. For at least the foregoing reasons, the Office Action's rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-11 under 35 USC § 102(b) has been overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is now requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolfe in view of Roth et al. (6,521,710).

It is believed that the Wolfe reference has been adequately addressed in the foregoing remarks relating to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-11 under 35 USC §102(b), and those comments are also applicable here. Because independent claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-11 are allowable over the Wolfe reference, dependent claim 14 should also be allowable. Accordingly, the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is now requested.

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the issues raised in the Office Action. With this paper, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and the allowance of the pending claims is now solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes a telephone conference would facilitate the resolution of one or more issues relating to this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

April 10, 2008
Date

By: Daniel R. Pastirik
Daniel R. Pastirik, Reg. No.: 33,025
Telephone No.: 651-737-2685

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833